REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT – ADDITIONAL WORK
REVISED SECOND REVIEW – OCTOBER 2014

Agency Information

Agency Name: Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board)	Address: 320 West 4th Street, Suite 200 Los Angeles, CA 90013
Agency Caseworker: Noman Chowdhury	Case No.: 908040261

Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 18154	GeoTracker Global ID: T0603762297
Site Name: Gilbert Reese Trust	Site Address: 5600 7th Street Long Beach, CA 90804
Responsible Party: The Makena Great American Seventy Company, LLC Attn: Matthew Huss	Address: 8350 W. Sahara Ave, #210 Las Vegas, NV 89117
Responsible Party: Gilbert Reese Trust Attn: Bob Flickinger	Address: Private Address
Responsible Party: Donald Robertson	Address: 1450 El Camino Real, 2nd Fl. Tustin, CA 92780
USTCF Expenditures to Date: $611,481	Number of Years Case Open: 10

To view all public documents for this case available on GeoTracker use the following URL.
URL: http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0603762297

Summary

The Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank (UST) Case Closure Policy (Policy) contains general and media-specific criteria, and cases that meet those criteria are appropriate for closure pursuant to the Policy. This case meets all of the required criteria of the Policy. Highlights of the case follow:

This case is a former active commercial petroleum fueling facility and an active commercial business. An unauthorized release was reported in January 2004 following the removal of six USTs (three gasoline, three diesel). Approximately 244 tons of impacted soil were excavated and disposed offsite in 2004. Soil vapor extraction pilot test was conducted in September 2007, which reportedly removed 288 pounds of total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg). The extraction rate of TPHg was 144 pounds per day. Since 2005, ten groundwater monitoring wells have been installed and monitored. According to groundwater data, water quality objectives have been achieved or nearly achieved for all constituents except in the source area.

The petroleum release is limited to the soil and shallow groundwater. According to data available in GeoTracker, there are no public water supply wells or surface water bodies within 1,000 feet of the defined plume boundary. No other water supply wells have been identified

within 1,000 feet of the defined plume boundary in files reviewed. The unauthorized release is located within the service area of a public water system, as defined in the Policy. The affected shallow groundwater is not currently being used as a source of drinking water, and it is highly unlikely that the affected shallow groundwater will be used as a source of drinking water in the foreseeable future. Other designated beneficial uses of impacted groundwater are not threatened, and it is highly unlikely that they will be, considering these factors in the context of the site setting.

Rationale for Closure under the Policy

- General Criteria: The case meets all eight Policy general criteria.
- Groundwater Specific Criteria: The case does not meet Policy criteria. The MTBE plume has not been fully defined to the east.
- Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air: The case meets Policy Criterion 2a by Scenario 1. The minimum distance between the groundwater containing greater than 1,000 µg/L benzene and all existing or potential buildings is greater than 30 feet, and the intervening soil contains less than 100 mg/kg of TPH.
- Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure: The case meets Policy Criterion 3a. Maximum concentrations in soil are less than those in Policy Table 1 for Commercial/Industrial use, and the concentration limits for a Utility Worker are not exceeded. There are no soil sample results in the case record for naphthalene. However, the relative concentration of naphthalene in soil can be conservatively estimated using the published relative concentrations of naphthalene and benzene in gasoline. Taken from Potter and Simmons (1998), gasoline mixtures contain approximately 2 percent benzene and 0.25 percent naphthalene. Therefore, benzene can be used as a surrogate for naphthalene concentrations with a safety factor of eight. Benzene concentrations from the Site are below the naphthalene thresholds in Policy Table 1. Therefore, the estimated naphthalene concentrations meet the thresholds in Table 1 and the Policy criteria for direct contact by a factor of eight. It is highly unlikely that naphthalene concentrations in the soil, if any, exceed the threshold.

Objections to Closure and Responses

The Regional Water Board objects to UST case closure (GeoTracker's LTCP Checklist dated 5/27/2014) because:

- The free product needs to be removed.
  RESPONSE: No measurable free product currently observed.
- Groundwater plume has not been fully delineated.
  RESPONSE: We concur.
- The case does not meet Policy criteria for vapor intrusion to indoor air.
  RESPONSE: The case meets Policy Criterion 2a by Scenario 1.

Recommendation

The Fund recommends that the Regional Water Board direct the Responsible Party to define the plume to the east of well MW-5 and to the north and west of well MW-4, that active groundwater remediation be performed in the center of the plume to reduce MTBE concentrations, and that groundwater monitoring continue so as to assess the MTBE trend and the presence of free product in well MW-4.

Mark Owens 10/20/2014

Mark Owens, P.E. Date
Water Resource Engineer
Technical Review Unit
(916) 341-5763

Robert Trommer 10/20/2014

Robert Trommer, C.H.G. Date
Senior Engineering Geologist
Chief, Technical Review Unit
(916) 341-5684